



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,912	02/03/2004	Gaurav Aggarwal	14101US03	1702
23446 7590 09/30/2008 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER				
RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/770,912

Applicant(s)

AGGARWAL ET AL.

Examiner

Andy S. Rao

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/4/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 10 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 10 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/4/08 has been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to amended claims 1-7, 9-10, 12 (amended) as filed 9/4/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. The Applicant presents one argument contending the Examiner's rejection of previously pending claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nallur et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Nallur"), as was set forth in the Office Action of 6/2/08, said argument being presented in support of the currently amended claims 1-7, 9-10, 12 which positively recites the "...while storing the first decoded reference picture, wherein the first decoded reference picture is an entry point picture..." limitations. However, after consideration of the arguments presented and further scrutiny of the applied Nallur reference, the Examiner must respectfully disagree and maintain the applicability of the reference as the basis of the grounds of rejection that follows.

After summarizing the salient features of independent claims 1 and 4 which now have been amended to recite the "while storing the first decoded reference picture, wherein the first decoded reference picture is an entry point picture..." limitation (RCE of 9/4/08: page 5, lines 1-12), the Applicant argues that the reference does not address this feature because Nallur's entry point playback is discussed with respect to a compressed video presentation stored on the storage

device (RCE of 9/4/08: page 5, lines 13-25), as in the claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that in response to a requested playback of the compressed video presentation is actually decoded (Nallur: column 7, lines 50-67), and it is noted that using the specified cache (Nallur: column 8, lines 5-15), a first decoded reference picture can be stored while displaying the other pictures in reverse order such that the decoded reference correspond to an entry point as specified in the compressed stream (Nallur: column 7, lines 25-30). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that the limitation remains met.

A detailed rejection follows below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nallur et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Nallur").

Nallur discloses a method for rewinding a group of pictures (Nallur: figures 3-6), said method comprising: storing a first decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 11, lines 10-20) from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 9, lines 55-65; column 10, lines 1-25); decoding a first one or more pictures from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 12, lines 20-30); displaying the first one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 7, lines 5-14), while storing the first decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 8, lines 5-15), wherein the first decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 7, lines 50-67) is an entry point picture (Nallur: column 25-30); storing a second decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 11, lines 10-20) from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 9, lines 55-65; column 10, lines 1-25); decoding a second one or more pictures from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 12, lines 20-30); displaying the second one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 7, lines 5-14); storing a third decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 11, lines 10-20) from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 9, lines 55-65; column 10, lines 1-25); decoding a third one or more pictures (Nallur: column 12, lines 20-30); and displaying the third one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 7, lines 5-14), as in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Nallur discloses wherein the group of pictures comprises a HITS stream (Nallur: column 1, lines 55-65), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 3, Nallur discloses wherein the group of pictures comprises 20 pictures (Nallur: column 7, lines 15-25; column 10, lines 50-67; column 11, lines 1-20), as in the claim.

Nallur discloses a system for rewinding a group of pictures (Nallur: column , said system comprising: one or more image buffers for storing a first, second, and third reference picture from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 9, lines 55-65; column 10, lines 1-25); a decompression engine for decoding a first, second, and third one or more pictures from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 12, lines 20-30); and a display engine for displaying (Nallur: column 10, lines 25-40) the first, second, and third one or more pictures from the group of pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 7, lines 5-25), and while storing the first decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 8, lines 5-15), wherein the first decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 7, lines 50-67) is an entry point picture (Nallur: column 25-30); as in claim 4.

Regarding claim 5, Nallur discloses wherein the group of pictures comprises a HITS stream (Nallur: column 1, lines 55-65).

Regarding claim 6, Nallur discloses wherein the group of pictures comprises 20 pictures (Nallur: column 7, lines 15-25; column 10, lines 50-67; column 11, lines 1-20), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 7 and 10, Nallur discloses storing the second decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 8, lines 5-15) while displaying the second one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 5, lines 10-20); and storing the third decoded reference picture while displaying the third one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 5, lines 10-20), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 9, Nallur discloses wherein the first one or more pictures are decoded in the forward display order (Nallur: column 1, lines 50-60), as in the claim. The system of claim 7, wherein the first decoded reference picture further comprises an entry point picture.

Regarding claim 12, Nallur discloses wherein the first one or more pictures are decoded in the forward display order (Nallur: column 1, lines 50-60), as in the claim.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Honjo discloses a method and apparatus for reproduction of video information. Abelard discloses a method and device for decoding a video stream in trick mode.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (571)-272-7337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andy S. Rao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621

asr
/Andy S. Rao/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621
September 26, 2008